DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 199 UD 028 685

AUTHOR Slavin, Robert E.; Yampolsky, Renee
TITLE Success for All: Effects on Students with Limited English Proficiency: A Three-Year Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, Baltimore, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO CDS-R-29
PUB DATE Mar 92
CONTRACT R117-R90002
NOTE 25p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Asian Americans; *Cambodians; Compensatory Education; *Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary School Students; *English (Second Language); Equal Education; *Limited English Speaking; Primary Education; Program Evaluation; Reading Achievement; *Reading Instruction; Urban Schools; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS Language Minorities; *Philadelphia School District PA

ABSTRACT

A study was done of the effects of the "Success for All" program on limited English proficient (LEP) elementary school students, principally Cambodian students in an inner-city Philadelphia (Pennsylvania) school. The program is a schoolwide restructuring focusing on prevention and early intervention in schools serving disadvantaged students. It includes research-based innovations in curriculum and instruction in all grades, one-to-one tutoring for at-risk students, and other elements. The study evaluated the program's effects after a 3-year period of implementation. Program adaptations for the LEP population included closely integrating English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) staff and services into the regular classroom program, focusing ESL instruction on the skills needed for success in the English reading programs, and using peer tutoring for kindergartners to help their transition into English reading. The compared Cambodian students in a matched school showed strong positive program effects on individually administered reading measures at all grade levels (kindergarten through grade 3). Positive effects on English language proficiency were also seen in kindergarten through grade 2, and positive reading effects for non-LEP students were found in kindergarten through grade 2. Included are 9 tables and 19 references. (Author/JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

UD

ED346199

CDS

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

SUCCESS FOR ALL

Effects on Students with Limited English Proficiency: A Three-Year Evaluation

Robert E. Slavin

Renee Yampolsky

Report No. 29

March 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

VO 028 685

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Advisory Panel

Beatriz Arias, College of Education, Arizona State University

Mary Frances Berry, Department of History, University of Pennsylvania

Anthony S. Bryk, Department of Education, University of Chicago

Michael Charleston, Department of Education,
University of Colorado at Denver

Constance E. Clayton, Superintendent, Philadelphia Public Schools

Edmund Gordon (Chair), Department of Psychology, Yale University

Ronald D. Henderson, National Education Association

Vinetta Jones, Executive Director, EQUITY 2000, College Board

Arturo Madrid, Director, Tomas Rivera Center

Hernan LaFontaine, Superintendent, Hartford Public Schools

William Julius Wilson, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago

Center Liaison

Harold Himmelfarb, Office of Educational Research and Improvement

SUCCESS FOR ALL

Effects on Students with Limited English Proficiency: A Three-Year Evaluation

Robert E. Slavin

Johns Hopkins University

Renee Yampolsky

Philadephia Public Schools

Grant No. R117 R90002

Report No. 29

March 1992

Published by the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, supported as a national research and development center by funds from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the OERI, and no official endorsement should be inferrred.

Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students
The Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

The Center

The mission of the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students (CDS) is to significantly improve the education of disadvantaged students at each level of schooling through new knowledge and practices produced by thorough scientific study and evaluation. The Center conducts its research in four program areas: The Early and Elementary Education Program, The Middle Grades and High Schools Program, the Language Minority Program, and the School, Family, and Community Connections Program.

The Early and Elementary Education Program

This program is working to develop, evaluate, and disseminate instructional programs capable of bringing disadvantaged students to high levels of achievement, particularly in the fundamental areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. The goal is to expand the range of effective alternatives which schools may use under Chapter 1 and other compensatory education funding and to study issues of direct relevance to federal, state, and local policy on education of disadvantaged students.

The Middle Grades and High Schools Program

This program is conducting research syntheses, survey analyses, and field studies in middle and high schools. The three types of projects move from basic research to useful practice. Syntheses compile and analyze existing knowledge about effective education of disadvantaged students. Survey analyses identify and describe current programs, practices, and trends in middle and high schools, and allow studies of their effects. Field studies are conducted in collaboration with school staffs to develop and evaluate effective programs and practices.

The Language Minority Program

This program represents a collaborative effort. The University of California at Santa Barbara is focusing on the education of Mexican-American students in California and Texas; studies of dropout among children of recent immigrants are being conducted in San Diego and Miami by Johns Hopkins, and evaluations of learning strategies in schools serving Navajo Indians are being conducted by the University of Northern Arizona. The goal of the program is to identify, develop, and evaluate effective programs for disadvantaged Hispanic, American Indian, Southeast Asian, and other language minority children.

The School, Family, and Community Connections Program

This program is focusing on the key connections between schools and families and between schools and communities to build better educational programs for disadvantaged children and youth. Initial work is seeking to provide a research base concerning the most effective ways for schools to interact with and assist parents of disadvantaged students and interact with the community to produce effective community involvement.

Abstract

Success for All is a schoolwide restructuring program focusing on prevention and early intervention in schools serving disadvantaged students. It includes research-based innovations in curriculum and instruction in all grades, one-to-one tutoring for at-risk students, and other elements. This report presents a three-year evaluation of the effects of Success for All on limited English proficient (LEP) students, principally Cambodian students in an inner-city Philadelphia school. (Previous CDS Reports Nos. 5 and 14 report on the first- and second-year evaluations, respectively.) Program adaptations for the LEP population included closely integrating ESL staff and services into the regular classroom program, focusing ESL instruction on the skills needed for success in the English reading program, and using peer tutoring for kindergartners to help them transition into English reading. A three-year evaluation in comparison to Cambodian students in a matched school showed strong positive program effects on individually administered reading measures at all grade levels, K-3. Positive effects on English language proficiency were also seen in grades K-2, and positive reading effects for non-LEP students were found in grades K-2. These results suggest that an ESL program closely linked to classroom instruction can accelerate the reading and English language performance of LEP students.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Lionel Laurer, Jim Ayres, Katherine Connor, Vicky Celotto, Carl Grossman, Bob Petza, Mary Leighton, Rene Dahl, and the staff and students of Francis Scott Key Elementary School for their assistance with this research, and Walter Secada and Daniel Holt for their thoughtful reviews of an earlier draft.

Introduction

Success for All is a program designed to ensure that every child who enters school, regardless of home background, will succeed in basic skills in the early grades and then maintain that success through the elementary years. The program uses innovative kindergarten and grade 1-3 reading programs, one-to-one tutoring from certified teachers for students who are having difficulties in reading, frequent assessment, family support services, and other interventions to try to make sure that students begin with success and remain successful through the early grades. Studies of Success for All have found substantial positive effects of the program on student reading achievement and reduced retentions and special education referrals in schools primarily serving disadvantaged African American students (Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1990; Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Livermon, & Dolan, 1990; Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, Wasik, Shaw, Leighton, & Mainzer, 1991; Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1992).

In previous implementations of Success for All, the students involved have been from families who are usually poor, but where English is the language of the home. With such children it makes sense to make the promise that every child will read the first time they are taught, as long as effective instruction is given in the first place and is backed up by tutoring, family support services, or other resources if needed.

Yet there is one important category of students with needs that are quite different from those from disadvantaged but English speaking homes. These are students with limited English proficiency (LEP) who come from homes in which a language other than English is the principal means of communication. Many LEP children arrive in kindergarten with little or no English, and face the daunting task of learning English at the same time as they are learning the regular school curriculum.

Many schools serving LEP children use bilingual education programs, in which students receive instruction in their native language in some subjects (particularly reading) while they are learning English. Research on bilingual education tends to support this approach (e.g., Hakuta & Garcia, 1989; Willig, 1985; Wong-Fillmore & Valadez, 1985). However, there are many circumstances in which bilingual education is not feasible, such as when there are too few children speaking any one language in a given school or when there are no teachers available who speak the students' language. In such situations, LEP students are simply taught in English, with English as a second language (ESL) instruction given as a supplement. Such programs put students in the difficult position of trying to learn to read in a language with which they have little facility.

The fundamental assumption of Success for All is that given appropriate instruction and adequate supplementary services fully integrated with classroom instruction, every child can learn to read in the first grade or shortly thereafter. Yet this assumption may not be valid with children who start kindergarten with little or no English. How can the Success for All approach be adapted to the needs of LEP children in an ESL program, and what impact will this have on their achievement? This is the focus of the present paper.

The central concept underlying the application of Success for All to a non-bilingual program for LEP students is that all of the school's personnel are working together to ensure the success of every child. This includes ESL teachers, who teach reading and closely integrate instruction in English with the requirements for success in the regular program, especially reading. In Success for All, ESL is not a separate program, but is an organic part of a coordinated approach designed to provide all children whatever they need to succeed. This is consistent with research supporting an emphasis in ESL programs on communication and academic content as opposed to formal instruction in English linguistic structures (Chamot & O'Malley, 1986; Garcia, 1991; Ovando & Collier, 1985).

Implementation of Success for All

Beginning in September 1988, researchers from The Johns Hopkins University began working with the staff at Philadelphia's Francis Scott Key Elementary School to implement Success for All in grades K-3. In 1988-89, Francis Scott Key served 622 students in grades K-8. Fifty-two percent of its students were from Asian backgrounds, primarily Cambodian. In 1990-91, this proportion has risen to 62%. Nearly all of these students enter the school in kindergarten with little or no English. Some of their fathers but few mothers speak English. The remainder of the school is divided between African American and white students. The school is located in an extremely impoverished neighborhood in South Philadelphia. Ninety-six percent of the students are from low-income families and qualify for free lunch.

Because of the unavailability of Cambodian-speaking teachers, Francis Scott Key uses an ESL approach to its LEP students. The only adult in the school who speaks Cambodian is an aide-level bilingual counseling assistant.

The Success for All program was implemented in a form similar to that in which it had been used in previous studies, with modifications to adapt to the needs of LEP students and of the school as a whole. The major program elements are described below (see Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1992, for more detail).

Reading Tutors

One of the most important elements of the Success for All model is the use of tutors to promote students' success in reading. One-to-one tutoring is the most effective form of instruction known (see Slavin, Karweit, & Madden, 1989). The tutors are certified teachers with experience teaching Chapter 1, special education, and/or primary reading. Tutors work one-on-one with students who are having difficulties keeping up with their reading groups. The tutoring occurs in 20-minute sessions taken from periods other than reading or math.

In general, tutors support students' success in the regular reading curriculum, rather than teaching different objectives. For example, if the regular reading teacher is working on long vowels, so does the tutor. However, tutors seek to identify learning problems and use different strategies to teach the same skills.

During daily two-hour reading/language arts periods, tutors serve as additional reading teachers to reduce class size for reading. At Francis Scott Key, there were five tutors. The four ESL teachers also taught a reading class, reducing class size from an average of about 30 during most of the day to about 15 during reading time. Reading teachers and tutors use brief forms to communicate about students' specific problems and needs and meet at regular times to coordinate their approaches with individual children.

Initial decisions about reading group placement and the need for tutoring are based on informal reading inventories that the tutors give to each child. Subsequent reading group placements and tutoring assignments are made based on eight-week assessments, which include teacher judgments as well as more formal assessments. First graders receive first priority for tutoring, on the assumption that the primary function of the tutors is to help all students be successful in reading the first time, before they become remedial readers.

Reading Program

Students in grades 1-3 are regrouped for reading. At Francis Scott Key, the students were assigned to heterogeneous, age-grouped classes with class sizes of about 30 most of the day. During a regular two hour reading/language arts period they were regrouped according to reading performance levels into reading classes of 15 students all at the same level. For example, a 2-1 reading/language arts class might contain first, second, and third grade students all reading at the same level. The reading groups were formed solely based on reading level, not language proficiency, so all contained LEP as well as non-LEP students. Regrouping allows teachers to teach the whole reading class without having to break the class into reading groups.

The reading program itself (Madden, Slavin, Livermon, Karweit, & Stevens, 1987) takes full advantage of having substantial amounts of time available for direct instruction (because there is

only one reading group in each class). Reading teachers at every grade level begin the reading time by reading children's literature to students and engaging them in a discussion of the story to enhance their understanding of the story, listening and speaking vocabulary, and knowledge of story structure.

In kindergarten and first grade, the program emphasizes development of basic language skills with the use of Story Telling and Retelling (STaR) (Karweit, 1988), which involves the students in listening to, retelling, and dramatizing children's literature. Big books as well as oral and written composing activities allow students to develop concepts of print as they also develop knowledge of story structure. Peabody Language Development kits are used to further develop receptive and expressive language.

Beginning reading is introduced in the second semester of kindergarten. In this program, letters and sounds are introduced in an active, engaging series of activities that begins with oral language and moves into written symbols. Once letter sounds are taught, they are reinforced by the reading of stories which use the sounds. The K-1 reading program uses a series of phonetically regular but interesting minibooks and emphasizes repeated oral reading to partners as well as to the teacher, instruction in story structure and specific comprehension skills, and integration of reading and writing.

When students reach the primer reading level, they use a form of Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) (Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, 1987) with the district's Macmillan basal series. CIRC uses cooperative learning activities built around story structure, prediction, summarization, vocabulary building, decoding practice, and story-related writing. Students engage in partner reading and structured discussion of the basal stories, and work toward mastery of the vocabulary and content of the story in teams. Story-related writing is also shared within teams.

In addition to these basal story-related activities, teachers provide direct instruction in reading comprehension skills, and students practice these skills in their teams. Classroom libraries of trade books at students' reading levels are provided for each teacher, and students read books of their choice for homework for 20 minutes each night. Home readings are shared via presentations, summaries, puppet shows, and other formats twice a week during "book club" sessions. Research on CIRC has found it to significantly increase students' reading comprehension and language skills (Stevens et al., 1987).

Eight-Week Reading Assessments

At eight week intervals, reading teachers assess how students are progressing through the reading program. The results of the assessments are used to determine who is to receive tutoring, to change students' reading groups, to suggest other adaptations in students' programs, and to identify students who need other types of assistance, such as family interventions or screening for vision and hearing problems.

Kindergarten

Francis Scott Key Elementary provides a kindergarten program that focuses on providing a balanced and developmentally appropriate learning experience for young children. The curriculum emphasizes the development and use of language. It provides a balance of academic readiness and non-academic music, art, and movement activities. Readiness activities include use of the Peabody Language Development Kits and a program called Story Telling and Retelling (STaR) in which students retell stories read by the teachers (Karweit, 1988). Prereading activities begin during the second semester of kindergarten.

At Francis Scott Key, a special addition was made to the usual form of the Success for All program. This was a tutoring program in which older students worked for forty-five minutes two days per week tutoring kindergarten students. Seventh and eighth graders were involved in this program in 1988-89, but grades 6-8 were moved to a middle school in 1989-90 and fifth graders became the tutors. All kindergartners received and benefitted from tutoring, but there was a particular benefit for the Cambodian students, who were assigned to Cambodian tutors. The tutors read to and with their tutees in English, translating when necessary. Over the course of the year, the discussions developed from being primarily Cambodian to primarily English.

In a school lacking Cambodian-speaking adults, the older students provided the Cambodian kindergartners with their only opportunity to use their primary language in an instructional context. This was particularly important early in the year, when the Cambodian kindergartners arrived with little or no English.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program Facilitator

A program facilitator works at Francis Scott Key full-time to oversee (with the principal) the operation of the Success for All model. The facilitator helps plan the Success for All program, helps the principal with scheduling, and visits classes and tutoring sessions frequently to help teachers and tutors with individual problems. She works directly with the teachers on implementation of the curriculum, classroom management, and other issues, and helps teachers and tutors deal with any behavior problems or other special problems.

Teachers and Teacher Training

The teachers and tutors are regular Philadelphia Public Schools teachers. They received detailed teacher's manuals supplemented by two days of inservice at the beginning of the school year. For teachers of grades 1-3 and for reading tutors, these training sessions focused on implementation of the reading program, and their detailed teachers' manuals covered general teaching strategies as well as specific lessons.

Kindergarten teachers and aides were trained in use of the STaR and Peabody programs, thematic units, and other aspects of the kindergarten model. Tutors later received an additional day of training on tutoring strategies and reading assessment.

Throughout the year, inservice presentations covered such topics as classroom management, instructional pace, and cooperative learning, and the facilitator and Johns Hopkins staff organized many informal sessions to allow teachers to share problems and problem solutions, suggest changes, and discuss individual children. The staff development model used in Success for All emphasizes relatively brief initial training with extensive classroom followup and coaching and group discussion.

English as a Second Language

Students identified as limited English proficient (LEP) participated in the Success for All reading and language arts program (in English) along with their English-dominant classmates during a common period in the morning. However, these students also received separate ESL instruction in the afternoon. Students identified as beginning or intermediate in English received two 45-minute periods of ESL each day, while advanced students received one period.

The instruction provided in ESL was also quite different from that given in the district as a whole. At Francis Scott Key, the focus of the ESL program was on supporting students' success in the regular reading program. The ESL teachers used the materials and techniques of the Success for All reading program to help students with specific difficulties.

With the younger children, there was an emphasis on the program elements used in Success for All to enhance the language development of all students, such as use of the Peabody Language Development Kits, Story Telling and Retelling (STaR), listening comprehension activities, and (with older students) activities involving identification of characters, settings, problems, and problem solutions in narratives, story summaries, and reading comprehension instruction. The program philosophy emphasized the importance of providing LEP students with help on the specific activities that constitute success in the regular school program, particularly reading activities.

Methods

Evaluation Design

The program at Francis Scott Key was evaluated in comparison to a similar Philadelphia elementary school. Table 1 compares the two schools on several variables. As the Table shows, the two schools were very similar in overall achievement level and other variables. Thirty-three percent of the comparison school's students were Asian (mostly Cambodian), the highest proportion in the city after Key. The percentage of students receiving free lunch was very high in both schools, though higher at Key (96%) than at the comparison school (84%).

==========

Table 1 Here

==========

A few differences are worthy of note, however. The comparison school was larger than Key, with 1,128 students overall and 541 students in grades K-3 to Key's 622 and 365, and the non-Asian students at the comparison school were almost all African American, while 21% of Key's students were white.

The data reported here are for all students in grades K-3 in Spring, 1991. This means that, with the exception of transfers, third graders had been in Success for All since first grade and all other students had been in the program since kindergarten.

Measures

At Francis Scott Key and its comparison school, all students in grades K-3 were given individually administered tests in Spring 1991. The testers were mostly students from local universities. The measures were as follows.

1. Kindergarten measures. In kindergarten, all students were individually administered four scales assessing language development and pre-reading skills: the Woodcock (1984) Letter-Word Identification scale, the Merrill Language Screening Test's Comprehension scale (Mumm, Secord, & Dykstra, 1980), and the Test of Language Development (TOLD) Picture Vocabulary and Sentence Imitation scales (Newcomer & Hammill, 1988).

2. Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery (Woodcock, 1984). The Woodcock scales, Letter-Word Identification and Word Attack, were individually administered to students in grades 1-3, and Letter-Word was also given to kindergarten students. The Letter-Word scale was used to assess recognition of letters and common sight words, while the Word Attack scale assessed phonetic synthesis skills.

3. Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty (Durrell and Catterson, 1980). The Durrell Oral Reading scale was administered to students in grades 1-3. Oral Reading presents a series of graded reading passages followed by comprehension questions, which students read aloud.

4. IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT). The IPT (Dalton, Amori, Ballard, & Tighe, 1982) is a test of English language proficiency administered to all Asian students. The test yields six levels of proficiency based on students' abilities to understand and use English, follow directions, use correct grammatical constructions, and so on.

Analyses

For the three reading measures and the four kindergarten achievement measures, data were first analyzed using multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA), taking all scales together. The multivariate analysis indicates the program's effect on a factor composed from the individual dependent measures. Univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) were then conducted on each outcome separately. Univariate analyses are usually considered interpretable if the multivariate test is significant at $p < .10$ or beyond. Only univariate ANOVA's were done on the language proficiency measures.

Outcomes are characterized in terms of effect sizes, which are the difference between experimental and control means divided by the control group's standard deviation. Grade equivalents were not used in any analyses, but are presented as convenient indicators of students' absolute performance levels.

Results

Asian Students

The results for Asian students are summarized in Tables 2-5. Success for All Asian students at all grade levels performed far better than control students. In kindergarten, Asian students at Key School scored substantially better than control students on the Woodcock Letter-Word, Merrill Comprehension, and TOLD Picture Vocabulary scales. The multivariate analysis (MANOVA)

was highly significant (p<.001). MANOVA's for reading were statistically significant at all grade levels, 1-3 (p <.005 or less), and every univariate comparison was significant (p <.05 or less). Success for All students exceeded control in reading by almost five months in first grade (ES = +1.24), 1.2 years in second grade (ES = +1.85), and eight months in third grade (ES = +.64).

==========
Tables 2 - 5 Here
==========

On the IDEA Proficiency Test, Success for All Asian students performed significantly better than their control counterparts in grades K-2. However, the size of the differences declined each year, and by third grade there were no differences in English proficiency. This pattern was probably due to a ceiling effect. There are six levels on the IPT, A-F. Third graders in both schools were doing very well in English. They averaged near Level E, which requires students to describe and organize the main properties of common objects, discriminate differences between such words as hid and hit, ask questions in the past tense, know the opposites of "difficult" and "youngest," and so on.

Non-Asian Students

Outcomes of Success for All for non-Asian students were also very positive in grades 1-2, but there were few differences in kindergarten and none in the third grade. These results are summarized in Tables 6 - 9.

==========
Tables 6 - 9 Here
==========

Success for All kindergartners scored significantly higher than control students on the Woodcock Letter-Word scale (ES = +.57), but differences on other measures were not significant. However, differences in reading in grades 1-2 were substantial. First graders exceeded their control group by an average of 5.5 months (ES = +.70). The multivariate analysis was statistically significant (p <.001), as were all three univariate analyses. In second grade, non-Asian students at Key scored six months ahead of controls (ES = +.38), and the multivariate analysis was marginally significant (p <.07). Univariate analyses were significant for the two Woodcock scores (p <.05), but not for the Durrell. In third grade, there were no differences on any measure between Success for All and control non-Asians.

Discussion

The results of the three-year evaluation of Success for All at Francis Scott Key Elementary School confirm a pattern seen in other Success for All schools (see Madden et al., 1991). First, the effects are typically strongest for the students who began their reading instruction in the program. At Key, kindergartners and first and second graders had their first exposure to reading instruction in Success for All, and are performing substantially better than their counterparts. Smaller effects are typically seen for students who started Success for All after a year or more of traditional instruction. As the students move through the grades, they increase their advantage over students in traditional classes. For example, at Baltimore's Abbottston Elementary School, which has completed four years of implementation, third graders (in the program since kindergarten) scored above grade level (GE = 4.1) in spring, 1991, 1.3 years ahead of their control group (see Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1992). A similar progression is beginning at Key school as the students who began in kindergarten and first grade are achieving and maintaining success in reading. Third graders, who did not experience the Success for All kindergarten, had the smallest effects.

The second finding typical of Success for All and seen at Key is that the effects of the program are greatest for the lowest achievers. In other Success for All schools these are students who score in the lowest 25% on pretests, but at Key and its comparison school these are the Asian students, who start their schooling with little or no English. In particular, the use of the ESL program and one-to-one tutoring at Key to support students' success in reading clearly paid

off in reading skills as well as in English language proficiency.

The results for the Asian students on the reading and language proficiency measures conform to an interesting pattern. Success for All Asian students performed significantly better in English language proficiency than control students in grades K-2, but the differences diminished over time. By the third grade, Asian students in both schools had very good English skills. However, the faster start in English experienced by the Asian students at Key gave them a substantial advantage in reading. By the time control students caught up in English, they were far behind in reading. In an ESL program, it would seem critical both to build English skills rapidly in kindergarten and to focus ESL instruction on the particular English skills needed to help students succeed in reading.

The Success for All implementation at Key School appears to be showing that within the context of an ESL approach, integrating ESL services and staff with the beginning reading program can pay off in both reading and language proficiency for LEP students. There is still a long way to go to achieve the program's goal of success for every child, but the results as of the end of the third year show that the implementation of Success for All at Key School is headed in the right direction.

References

Chamot, A.U., & O'Malley, 1986. A cognitive-academic language learning approach: An ESL content-based curriculum. Wheaton, MD: National Clearing House for Bilingual Education.

Dalton, E.F., Amori, B.A., Ballard, W.S., & Tighe, P.L. (1982). IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test I-English. Brea, CA: Ballard & Tighe.

Durrell, D., & Catterson, J. (1980). Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

Garcia, E.E. (1991). Bilingualism, second language acquisition, and the education of Chicano language minority students. In R.R. Valencia (Ed.), Chicano school failure and success: Research and policy agendas for the 1990's. New York: Falmer.

Hakuta, K., & Garcia, E. (1989). Bilingualism and education. American Psychologist, 44, 374-379.

Karweit, N.L. (1988). Story Telling and Retelling (STaR): Teacher's manual. The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., Wasik, B.A., Shaw, A., Leighton, M., and Mainzer, K.L. (1991, April). Success for all: Multi-year effects of a schoolwide elementary restructuring program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., Livermon, B.J., Karweit, N.L., & Stevens, R.J. (1987). Success for All: Teacher's manual for reading. The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Mumm, M., Secord, W., & Dykstra, K. (1980). Merrill Language Screening Test. New York: Psychological Corporation.

Newcomer, P.L., & Hammill, D.D. (1988). Test of Language Development-2. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Ovando, C., & Collier, V. (1985). Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., & Madden, N.A. (Eds.) (1989). Effective programs for students at risk. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B.A. (1990). Success for All: Effects of variations in duration and resources of a schoolwide elementary restructuring program. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, The Johns Hopkins University.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Livermon, B.J., & Dolan, L. (1990). Success for All: First-year outcomes of a comprehensive plan for reforming urban education. American Educational Research Journal, 27, 255-278.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B.A. (1992). Success for All: A relentless approach to prevention and early intervention in elementary schools. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Stevens, R.J., Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., & Farnish, A.M. (1987). Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition: Two field experiments. Reading Research Quarterly, 22, 433-454.

Willig, A.C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. Review of Educational Research, 55, 269-317.

Wong-Fillmore, L., & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Woodcock, R. W. (1984). Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery. Allen, TX: DLM.

Table 1

Characteristics of Francis Scott Key and Comparison School

Characteristics	Key	Comparison
School Enrollment	622	1,128
School Enrollment, K-3	365	541
Ethnic Composition		
Asian	62%	33%
White	21%	0%
African American	15%	65%
Other	3%	2%
National Percentile — Reading, Spring 1988		
K	42	52
1	37	34
2	17	26
3	33	27
Average Daily Attendance	90%	91%
Percent Free Lunch	96%	84%

Table 2
Effects of Success for All
Kindergarten: Asian Students

Test		SFA (N=43)	Control (N=18)	Effect Size	p<
Woodcock Letter-Word	x (SD)	9.35 (3.82)	5.56 (2.04)	+1.86	.001
Merriill Comprehension	x (SD)	1.79 (1.44)	0.78 (1.17)	+.87	.005
TOLD Picture Vocabulary	x (SD)	8.95 (5.04)	5.67 (3.65)	+.90	.02
TOLD Sentence Imitation	x (SD)	1.89 (1.49)	2.33 (2.91)	-.15	ns
MANOVA					.001
Language Proficiency (IDEA)	x (SD)	2.64 (0.87)	1.68 (0.58)	+1.64	.001

Table 3
Effects of Success for All
Grade 1: Asian Students

Test		SFA (N=69)	Control (N=41)	Effect Size	p<
Woodcock Letter-Word	x	17.57	11.60	+1.04	.001
	(SD)	(5.48)	(5.73)		
	GE	1.57	1.19		
Woodcock Word Attack	x	5.72	1.00	+1.57	.001
	(SD)	(4.59)	(3.00)		
	GE	2.02	1.38		
Durrell Oral	x	4.49	1.33	+1.11	.001
	(SD)	(3.86)	(2.85)		
	GE	1.68	1.23		
Mean Reading Achievement	GE	1.76	1.27	+1.24	.001
Language Proficiency (IDEA)	x	2.91	2.31	+.79	.001
	(SD)	(.82)	(.77)		

Table 4
Effects of Success for All
Grade 2: Asian Students

Test		SFA (N=56)	Control (N=41)	Effect Size	p<
Woodcock Letter-Word	x	26.55	18.07	+1.49	.001
	(SD)	(7.86)	(5.71)		
	GE	2.61	1.61		
Woodcock Word Attack	x	10.69	2.54	+2.71	.001
	(SD)	(6.86)	(3.01)		
	GE	3.08	1.50		
Durrell Oral	x	12.71	6.10	+1.36	.001
	(SD)	(7.55)	(4.88)		
	GE	3.05	1.95		
Mean Reading Achievement	GE	2.91	1.69	+1.85	.001
Language Proficiency (IDEA)	x	3.89	3.37	+.41	.05
	(SD)	(1.21)	(1.27)		

Table 5
Effects of Success for All
Grade 3: Asian Students

Test		SFA (N=49)	Control (N=28)	Effect Size	p<
Woodcock Letter-Word	x	27.17	22.75	+.50	.05
	(SD)	(9.27)	(8.80)		
	GE	2.75	2.03		
Woodcock Word Attack	x	10.34	5.81	+.95	.001
	(SD)	(5.21)	(4.76)		
	GE	3.29	2.17		
Durrell Oral	x	16.53	13.57	+.47	.05
	(SD)	(8.15)	(6.36)		
	GE	3.69	3.03		
Mean Reading Achievement	GE	3.24	2.41	+.64	.005
Language-Proficiency (IDEA)	x	4.70	4.78	-.05	ns
	(SD)	(1.64)	(1.52)		

Table 6
Effects of Success for All
Kindergarten: Non-Asian Students

Test		SFA (N=32)	Control (N=38)	Effect Size	p<
Woodcock Letter-Word	x (SD)	8.56 (3.68)	6.61 (3.43)	+.57	.05
Merriill Comprehension	x (SD)	3.63 (1.31)	3.82 (1.41)	-.16	ns
TOLD Picture Vocabulary	x (SD)	12.81 (4.12)	11.16 (4.69)	+.35	ns
TOLD Sentence Imitation	x (SD)	8.36 (7.06)	8.71 (5.60)	-.06	ns
MANOVA					.06

Table 7
Effects of Success for All
Grade 1: Non-Asian Students

Test		SFA (N=46)	Control (N=91)	Effect Size	p<
Woodcock Letter-Word	x	19.53	16.25	+.47	.05
	(SD)	(6.87)	(7.01)		
	GE	1.71	1.47		
Woodcock Word Attack	x	7.88	3.23	+1.15	.001
	(SD)	(6.03)	(4.03)		
	GE	2.41	1.80		
Durrell Oral	x	6.29	4.17	+.47	.05
	(SD)	(5.94)	(4.47)		
	GE	2.41	1.63		
Mean Reading Achievement	GE	2.18	1.63	+.70	.001

Table 8
Effects of Success for All
Grade 2: Non-Asian Students

Test		SFA (N=41)	Control (N=91)	Effect Size	p<
Woodcock Letter-Word	x	28.09	25.26	+.42	.05
	(SD)	(7.01)	(6.71)		
	GE	2.96	2.31		
Woodcock Word Attack	x	11.00	8.22	+.42	.05
	(SD)	(5.92)	(6.65)		
	GE	3.56	2.73		
Durrell Oral	x	14.52	12.42	+.30	ns
	(SD)	(7.87)	(7.03)		
	GE	3.35	3.00		
Mean Reading Achievement	GE	3.29	2.68	+.38	.07

Table 9
Effects of Success for All
Grade 3: Non-Asian Students

Test		SFA (N=36)	Control (N=67)	Effect Size	p<
Woodcock Letter-Word	x	28.28	29.76	-.27	ns
	(SD)	(8.10)	(5.47)		
	GE	3.00	3.34		
Woodcock Word Attack	x	11.28	11.28	.00	ns
	(SD)	(6.01)	(5.91)		
	GE	3.68	3.68		
Durrell Oral	x	18.67	18.36	+.04	ns
	(SD)	(6.71)	(7.28)		
	GE	4.04	3.99		
Mean Reading Achievement	GE	3.57	3.67	-.08	ns